

REMARKS

The Final Office Action of February 15, 2011, (“the Office Action”) has been carefully reviewed and the remarks that follow are responsive thereto. Claims 26, 27, 29, 32-35, 37, 40, 41, 43, 46-49, 51, and 54 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. Claims 1-25 were previously canceled. No claims have been added. No new matter has been introduced. Claims 26-54 thus remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 26-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over a non-patent reference entitled “Web Services Conceptual Architecture” by Heather Kreger (hereinafter “Kreger”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0090514 of Cole et al. (hereinafter “Cole”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended independent claim 26 recites a method, comprising, *inter alia*:

receiving, by a computing device, first business logic expressed in one or more declarative languages, the first business logic including a first process description, the first process description describing a first process of a business process instance in terms of one or more flows;

receiving, by the computing device, second business logic expressed in the one or more declarative languages, the second business logic including a second process description, the second process description describing a second process of the business process instance in terms of one or more rules, the second process being different from the first process; and

executing, by the computing device, the first business logic and the second business logic.

Support for these amendments may be found throughout the original figures and specification, such as in at least paragraphs [0082] and [0066] thereof. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Kreger and Cole, whether applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest such features.

The Office Action concedes, at pages 2-3, that Kreger does not disclose “rules and states in the description; wherein each of the one or more states represents a legal state transition for at least one business entity, and wherein each of the one or more rules represents a business rule or policy enforced on the at least one business entity in an externalized form.” However, the Office Action asserts, at page 3, that Cole discloses “a method for controlling business process by applying rules,

states, and flows [...] wherein each of the one or more states represents a legal state transition for at least one business entity [...] and wherein each of the one or more rules represents a business rule or policy enforced on the at least one business entity in an externalized form.”

Notwithstanding these assertions of the Office Action, neither Kreger nor Cole discloses the above-quoted features of amended independent claim 26. Indeed, while Kreger generally describes various business processes and workflows (*see e.g.* Kreger at pages 33-39) and Cole states that “[r]ules are used to define validity checks and constraints, and to manage the transition from one business process to another” (*see Cole at paragraph [0073]*), neither Kreger nor Cole, whether applied alone or in combination, disclose “receiving [...] first business logic [...] including a first process description [...] describing a first process of a business process instance in terms of one or more flows; receiving [...] second business logic [...] including a second process description [...] describing a second process of the business process instance in terms of one or more rules[; and] executing [...] the first business logic and the second business logic,” (emphasis added) as recited in amended independent claim 26. Thus, even assuming, without conceding, that Kreger and Cole are properly combinable, no combination thereof would have resulted in the features of amended independent claim 26.

For at least these reasons, amended independent claim 26 is distinguishable over Kreger and Cole. In addition, amended independent claims 40 and 54 recite similar features as amended independent claim 26, and thus, amended independent claims 40 and 54 are distinguishable over Kreger and Cole for substantially the same reasons as amended independent claim 26.

Claims 27-39 and 41-53 ultimately depend from amended independent claims 26 and 40, respectively, and therefore are distinguishable over Kreger and Cole by virtue of their dependence and further in view of the various features recited therein.

[SIGNATURE PAGE FOLLOWS]

CONCLUSION

All issues having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or if there are any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3000.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: May 16, 2011

By: _____ /Rajit Kapur/

Rajit Kapur
Registration No. 65,766

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051

Tel: 202.824.3000
Fax: 202.824.3001